

Green Global Dictatorship: Regional Governance, UN Agenda 21, Sustainable Development, and the Wildlands Project

Dr. Eric T. Karlstrom, Professor of Geography

My people perish for lack of knowledge.

Hosea 4:6

It seems indeed to be easier to deceive a multitude than one man.

Herodotus, Greek historian

The phony Christian-conservatives have never warned you about the very plan that is the very means whereby planners are silently, insidiously, and deceptively dragging America into a global government, the seat of which is intended to be the United Nations. That plan is "Regional Governance."

Jakie Patru, "Regionalism: Sneaking America into Global Government"

I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations.

James Madison

In most communities, neither victims, nor the proponents of sustainable development are aware that their plight is part of a global agenda. Indeed, most would scoff at the idea. Nevertheless, the transformation of America is well underway, without public debate or Congressional approval. From watershed, to ecosystem, to village, to city, to multi-county regions, to trans-boundary biospheres- the U.N. agenda is being systematically implemented- with the help of elected officials, paid for with the taxes of American citizens.

Henry Lamb, "Why the Government is Grabbing Our Land"

Government is not reason; its not eloquence; it is force! Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master.

George Washington

Private property and freedom are inseparable.

George Washington

I. Institutions Behind The Greening of America

In search for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like, would fit the bill...

The Club of Rome

In “The Greening of America Part 1- How Did It Happen?” (http://discerningtoday.org/greening_of_america1.htm), Dr. Michael Coffman (Ph.D. forester), notes that the “Greening of America” with its attendant conversion to Regional Governance, U.N. Agenda 21 (Agenda for the 21st Century), and Sustainable Development, began with the creation of the **United Nations** in 1945. In 1946, the **International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)** was formed as the primary scientific adviser to the **UN** on environmental issues. It was founded by Julien Huxley, who was also a founder of **UNESCO- United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization**. Members of the **IUCN** today include over 880 governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGO's) in 133 countries. In the U.S., **IUCN** members include the **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**, **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**, **U.S. National Park Service**, and **U.S. Forest Service**. Other **IUCN** members are the **U.N. Environmental Program (UNEP)**, the **UN Development Program (UNDP)**, **UNESCO**, as well as a host of NGOs, including the **Sierra Club**, **The Nature Conservancy (TNC)**, **National Wildlife Federation**, **National Audubon Society**, **Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)**, and the **Environmental Defense Fund (EDF)**. Two other major international environmental organizations were later created to also serve as advisers to the **UN**: the **World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF)** and the **World Resources Institute (WRI)**. Figure 1 (below) illustrates how federal agencies today cooperate with environmental groups to implement strategies devised by the **United Nations** in concert with the **IUCN**, **WWF**, and **WRI**. Coffman notes that almost every strategy implemented during the past 30 years (1978 to 2008) has originated with this “unholy alliance.”



Figure 1. Linkages between the **UN**, **IUCN**, **WWF**, **WRI** and federal agencies and environmental groups, from Dr. Coffman, “The Greening of America”

In “Diplomatic Immunity for the **Sierra Club**?” (<http://www.bitterroot.com/grizzly/coffman.htm>), Dr. Coffman notes that when President Clinton signed Executive Order 12986 in 1996, he extended diplomatic immunity to the **IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature)**. This means no lawsuits can be brought by Americans against the **IUCN**. Coffman asks the question: Since the **Sierra Club**, **Nature Conservancy**, etc. are members of the **IUCN**, does this give them diplomatic immunity from lawsuits as well?




Figure 2. Linkages between the IUCN, Sustainable Development, UN Agenda 21 and supporting agencies, from Coffman's "The Greening of America"

In addition to a plethora of United Nations agencies, including the *United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP)*, and *UNESCO*, the global environmental agenda is also advanced by thousands of non-governmental organizations (NGO's) and Green Advocacy Groups (GAGs). Eco-logic Magazine (Nov./Dec. 1995) noted that 7,892 Green Advocacy Groups (GAGs) attended at the 1992 *UN Conference on Environment and Development* in Rio de Janeiro.

II. Regional Governance.

Regional Governance is the method whereby would-be rulers intend to control every aspect of our lives. Without the full implementation of Regional Governance, their plan for world dominance cannot succeed.... (Governance, as opposed to Government, means "control by rules, restrictions, and regulations."). In order to subvert the sovereignty of the United States and the individual states guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution, a parallel and entirely unconstitutional governance structure, termed "Regional Government," has been covertly established over the past half century

Jakie Patru

All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void.

Marbury vs. Madison, 5 US (2 Branch) 137, 174, 176 (1803)

Regional government is the method by which the global ruling elite is slowly dismantling the sovereignty and constitutional protections of the world's nations. In "Regionalism: Sneaking America into World Government," Jakie Patru (<http://www.sweetliberty.org/issues/regionalism/sneaking.htm>) notes that using *United Nations* dictates, globalists have divided the planet into ten regions. North America is Region 1, South America is Region 6, etc. As has already been accomplished in Europe with the European Union, their plan calls for merging the North and South American regions through establishing trade agreements like the **FTAA (Free Trade Agreement of the Americas)** and a common currency.

The process of regionalizing America began long ago. In a 1969 press release, President Nixon designated ten federal regions, purportedly to "streamline the structure and processes of federal agencies in the field." Each region was to have an appointed chairman (bureaucrats accountable only to Washington, D.C.) for its **Federal Regional Council**. **Federal Regional Councils** were further defined and legitimized in Nixon's Executive Order 11647 of 1972 (http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html).

Nixon's executive order is in direct contravention of *Article IV, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution*, which states: "**The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.**" (Webster defines a republican form of government as one in which "the sovereign power resides in a certain body of the people- the electorate- and is exercised by representatives elected by, and responsible to, them"). Establishment of regional government also violates *Article IV, Section 3, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution*, which stipulates: "**New states may be admitted by Congress into this Union; but no new State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of Congress.**"

Four decades ago, alert citizens understood the implications of this regional system even before it was codified in Nixon's Executive Order 11647. The Dan Smoot Report of 2/1/1965 stated:

Advocates of government planning have visions of a new kind of America: they would transform our union of sovereign States into a regionally-planned, monolithically-unified nation divided into a score of metropolitan areas which sprawl across State boundary lines. Each area will be ruled, at the "local level," by only one governmental authority: a metropolitan government. Existing governments- city, county and State- will eventually be abolished.

In COUNT DOWN Newsletter of March 1973, Virginia R. Wilson stated: "Promoters of regional government claim it is a new form of government, but it is the oldest form in history- dictatorship."

Nixon's Executive Order 11490 of 1969 also set the stage for an American dictatorship, stating that the President can assume dictatorial powers in the event of a national emergency. (The president himself decides what constitutes a "national emergency.") In *American Opinion* (1973), Gary Allen observed: "This order, empowers (federal) Regional council members, under the color of law, to control all food supply, money and credit, transportation, communications, public utilities, hospitals and other essential facets of human existence.

In 1972, President Nixon also signed the **World Heritage Treaty**, drafted by the **United Nations Educational Scientific, Cultural Organization (UNESCO)**. The resulting **World Heritage Site/Biosphere Reserve Program** now has some 851 designated World Heritage Sites, of which 67 are in the United States.

The regional governance plan is that North America ("Region 1") is to merged into the **North American Union** (Corsi, 2007, **The Late Great U.S.A.**). The **Sierra Club**, in cooperation with the **IUCN** and the **UN**, has re-mapped North America into 21 "bio-regions." Just as the **United Nations** requires for each designated World Heritage site, each bio-region is divided into three zones: 1) wildness area where human intrusion is forbidden, 2) buffer zones surrounding the wilderness area where human access is strictly controlled and limited, and 3) cooperation zones, where humans would be permitted to live, although their activities could be sharply circumscribed.

The secret march from the present world of 190-odd nations to a one-world government has been slow, methodical and to most, an imperceptible process. Patru (http://www.sweetliberty.org/beware_metro.html). gives examples of the encroaching regionalism as of 2000:

Cascadia is a region controlled by the Pacific Northwest Economic Region (PNER), which has been created by compacts between five northwestern states- Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho and Alaska, and two Canadian provinces- British Columbia and Alberta." In a publication advertising Cascadia, Senator Mark Hatfield stated: "National regions are emerging as key environmental and economic units throughout the world."....

Border Region 21 has also erased national borders between Mexico and four southwestern states- California, Texas, New Mexico and Arizona. That's part of the NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) deal. ... (We see) how national and state borders are erased via regionalism. Now let's look at the method of eliminating the very core of our representative government... the local governments. Within the states they have created regions within the regions, called sub-state regions. The plan is packaged beautifully and sold to naïve, brainwashed (many corrupt) elected officials. The carrot is this: they're told that by forming consortiums,

compacts with other townships, or counties that they can save a lot of money on services and supplies. We'll create a Council of Governments (COG), control the purse, oversee, order and distribute and spend and spend.... The flow of money is always the same. From the federal government to the federal regional capitol to the COG.... and then to the local governments in return for their "compliance" with passing whatever laws and ordinances the federal planners dictate. Remember, the dictates emanate originally from the United Nations.

Under **UN** directives, Regional Governance has advanced significantly in the U.S. and worldwide. Today, it is inextricably bound up with a host of benign, even appealing-sounding phrases such as Sustainable Development, Smart Growth, the Wildlands Project, etc. But what are these programs in reality and how did they get here?

In 1976, with the consent of both our corrupt political parties, the U.S. adopted these recommendations from the first **United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat I)**:

- 1) a national policy on population distribution according to available resources.
- 2) public land control or ownership in the public interest with equitable distribution of benefits while assuring environmental impacts.
- 3) Land, a scarce resource, should be subject to public surveillance or control for the common interest.
- 4) Government must exercise full jurisdiction over land and freely plan the development of human settlements.

Population distribution?!!! Land subject to public control?!!! Government has full jurisdiction over land and plans development of human settlements?!!! This sounds more like the Soviet Union than the America of the U.S. Constitution. Read on.

III. Sustainable Development

Sustainable Development has continued to evolve as that of protecting the world's resources while its true agenda is to control the world's resources.

Joan Veon, "Sustainable Development, Agenda 21 and Prince Charles," 2004

<http://www.newswithviews.com/Veon/joan19.htm>

We all agree that communities, countries and the entire world need to incorporate the principles of Sustainable Development in order to preserve the quality of our environment and our lives, right? Certainly, this is what I have believed and taught in my university courses during the past 18 years! However, those who have looked more carefully at the public policy effects of Sustainable Development, such as the Freedom 21 Santa Cruz group (www.freedom21santacruz.net), give a very different perspective. In their article, "Transforming America: Sustainable Development" (www.freedom21santacruz.net/thereport/Transforming_America.pdf), the authors state:

Sustainable Development has three components: global land use, global education, and global population control and reduction. The international focus for Sustainable Development is the United States. This is because America is the only country in the world based on the ideals of private property. Private property is incompatible with the collectivist premise of Sustainable Development.... Sustainable Development works to abolish private property in order to manufacture natural resource shortages and other alarms in order to facilitate governmental control over all resources and ultimately all human action. So-called public/private partnerships are the major tool to accomplish this objective.

In "Sustainable Trouble: The Attempt to Transform the Vision of America"

(<http://www.freedom21santacruz.net/site/article.php?sid=247>), Michael Shaw notes:

The purpose of Sustainable Development is to create a government-controlled society. A government-controlled society is a trap door to the black hole of tyranny. The tonic of Sustainable Development is the honey of grant

money- a candy laced with poison. Business insiders receive short-term benefits from Smart Growth policies. The politically-powerful left promotes the anti-life, anti-liberty, and anti-poverty program called the Wildlands Project.

According to Deanna Spingola in "US Military Targets Southeast Colorado Part 3" <http://www.newswithviews.com/Spingola/deanna92.htm>), the concept of Sustainable Development came from the constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), Chapter 2, Article 18, where it discusses the need "to protect and make scientific, rational use of the land and its mineral and water resources, and the plant and animal kingdoms to preserve the purity of air and water, ensure reproduction of natural wealth, and improve the human environment."

The first Sustainable Development business council, the **Business Council for Sustainable Development**, was formed by Prince Charles in 1972. It included a who's who list of multinational corporations. In 1987, the term and concept were officially sanctioned in a **United Nations Commission on Environment and Development** report entitled, "Our Common Future." Today, Sustainable Development is promoted through "public-private partnerships" between government, industry, multi-national corporations, non-governmental organizations, foundations, non-profits, and sustainability grant recipients. Under the altruistic guise of "saving the environment," **The Nature Conservancy**, **Audubon Society** and hosts of other foundations, trusts, and conservation organizations have been buying up huge swaths of private land for supposed protection (see "Nature's Landlord: The Story of the World's Most Powerful Environmental Group: The Nature Conservancy" www.ccfassociation.org/findley03.pdf- and "Nature Conservancy or Nature Conspiracy?" <http://www.proliberty.com/observer/20080114.htm>). This land is often then placed under federal jurisdiction and/or in World or National Heritage Sites, bio-sphere reserves, conservation areas, etc.

Most of the people involved in the myriad and numerous organizations, government agencies, and activist groups involved in these land transfers are "**useful idiots**" in the sense that they do not understand the full implications of the **UN** plan they are helping to implement. In "Global Landgrab Coming to Your Neighborhood" Moriarty (2/27/05, <http://www.afn.org/-govern/sustain.html>), states:

The concept of sustainable development and sustainable communities is being implemented in every country on earth as part of a global plan. Maurice Strong (the mover behind all this), Secretary-General on Earth Summit II, said: '... What is needed is the recognition of the reality that...(it) is simply not feasible for (national) sovereignty to be exercised unilaterally by individual nation-states, however powerful.'

IV. Agenda 21 (United Nations Agenda for the 21st Century)

As its policies have been put into place, it has become clear that U.N. Agenda 21 is antithesis to the U.S. Constitution. U.N. Agenda 21 is worldwide collectivist government under the penumbra of the United Nations.

Freedom 21, Santa Cruz

An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed.

Norton vs. Shelby County 118 US 425 p. 442

Agenda 21 is being implemented through the use of facilitated stakeholder consensus councils, not by vote. These councils fit almost perfectly the definition of a state Soviet: a system of councils that report to an apex council and that implement a predetermined outcome affecting a region or a neighborhood. Members of a Soviet council are chosen by virtue of their willingness to comply with that outcome and their one-mindedness with the group. State Soviets are the operating mechanism of a government-controlled economy, whether it be

socialism or government-business (public-private) partnerships. Initially, soviets seem innocuous. The police state that associates with state soviets arise when the soviet web is sufficiently in place.

Transforming America: Sustainable Development

www.freedom21santacruz.net/thereport/Transforming_America.pdf

The **UN**'s website verifies that the Agenda 21 action plan is Sustainable Development. Agenda 21 (**UN** Agenda for the 21st Century) is a 300-page, 40-chapter, "soft-law" policy that came out of the **UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED)** in Rio De Janeiro, Brazil in 1992. (Maurice Strong was Secretary-General of this "Rio Earth Summit.") Agenda 21, though not legally binding, was adopted by 179 nations, including the United States, as a work plan to implement Sustainable Development. The following year, President Clinton created **The Presidents Council on Sustainable Development** through executive order. The 25-member council includes most Cabinet Secretaries, as well as representatives from **The Nature Conservancy**, the **Sierra Club** and other NGOs, as well as industry representatives. The function of this Council has been to find ways to implement Agenda 21 recommendations. In this manner, with virtually no legislative debate whatsoever, the federal government has been implementing Sustainable Development programs nationwide.

At first blush, Agenda 21 sounds good to many well-meaning people. However, Spingola ("U.S. Military Targets Southeast Colorado (Part 3 of 3) (<http://www.renewamerica.us/columns/spingola/080525>) notes: "Agenda 21 is a very well-organized plan to reinvent and regionalize government beginning with the '**rural cleansing**' of America and those referred to by the elite ruling class as resource-draining, expendable, "**useless eaters.**" Because Agenda 21 provides guidelines for local, regional, national, as well as global governance, it is radically transforming the entire world.

In "Agenda 21- The UN Blueprint for the 21st Century," (<http://windfarms.wordpress.com/2008/01/17/agenda-21---the-un-blueprint-for-the-21st-century/>), we read:

Like most "green movement initiatives," Agenda 21 is a "wolf in sheep's clothing." It is not an environmental management policy, but an attempt to impose a global centrally-planned quasi-government administered by the **United Nations**. Under Agenda 21, all central government and local authority signatories are required to conform strictly to a common prescribed standard and hence this is just communism resurrected in a new guise.

The fact that most people still have not even heard of Agenda 21, even though it was passed in 1992 and is now being implemented throughout most of the world, reveals the depth of interpenetration and cooperation between corporations, government, and the media. In "Why Are Americans Ignorant of 'Agenda 21'" (<http://www.newswithviews.com/Morrison/joyce36.htm>), Joyce Morrison notes that Agenda 21 is "the global plan to change the way we 'live, eat, learn and communicate' because we must save the earth." In "Local Agenda 21: The U.N. Plan for Your Community (http://www.crossroad.to/text/articles/la21_198.html) Berit Kjos notes that:

It's (Agenda 21) regulation would severely limit water, electricity, and transportation- even deny human access to our most treasured wilderness areas, it would monitor all lands and people. No one would be free from the watchful eye of the new global tracking and information system.

Agenda 21 seeks to regionalize America and other nations for the benefit of a tiny international elite. Regionalism works to blur political boundaries, take decision-making authority away from local peoples, and allow elected representatives to dodge accountability. The blurring of political boundaries, along with privatization of public assets, allows state collectivists to steal the wealth of the people. The goal of state collectivists is to abolish private property, increase government control over people, and to forcefully replace individualism with collectivism. Agenda 21 is also designed to implement the United Nations Charter and establish global governance under the United Nations. The U.N. Charter posits that ordinary humans are "biological resources" to be arranged by the elite into a sustainable number of worker bees and bee keepers. Indeed, under the U.N. Charter, as contrasted with the U.S. Constitution, peoples' rights are dependent upon his/her usefulness and compliance to the will of the elite.

Maurice Strong, Secretary-general of the 1992 **UNCED** conference (Rio Earth Summit), is a primary author of Agenda 21 and set the tone for the 1992 **UNCED** conference and the future, when he stated:

Current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class-- involving high meat consumption and large amounts of frozen and convenience foods, use of fossil fuels, appliances, home and workplace air-conditioning, and suburban housing are not sustainable. A shift is necessary which will require a vast strengthening of the multilateral system, including the United Nations.

In other words, the globalists' plan is to reduce the U.S. and other first world nations to the level of third world nations.

In "Agenda 21- What is it? How Did it Get Here?" (<http://www.freedom21santacruz.net/site/article.php?sid=394>), Henry Lamb states:

(Agenda 21) is a set of policy recommendations designed to reorganize global society around the principles of environmental protection, social equity, and what is called "sustainable" economic development. At the heart of the concept of sustainable development, is the assumption that government must manage society to ensure that human activity conforms to these principles. The idea that government is inherently empowered to manage the affairs of society is diametrically opposed to the idea that the just power of government is derived from the consent of the governed. As these conflicting principles collide in the arena of public policy, the people who are governed are losing the ability to limit the power of government. Consequently, government power over people is expanding. Nowhere is this transformation more dramatic than in the policies governing private property rights and the use of land and its resources.... The paradigm shift from sacred private property rights to government-managed land use, is a perfect example of how sustainable development is transforming America into a government-managed society.

This transformation is not the result of a deliberate decision made by elected representatives after a fair and public debate. It is the result of years of subtle influence and obscure processes relentlessly imposed through the **United Nations'** agencies and organizations, and multitude of non-governmental organizations accredited by, and sympathetic to the **United Nations'** agenda.

Lamb further notes that the most influential NGOs in the formulation of Agenda 21 were the **International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)**, the **Worldwide Fund for Nature** (formerly the **World Wildlife Fund**, and still known as **WWF**), and the **World Resources Institute (WRI)**. These three organizations also participated in the preparations for the **UN Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat I)** in 1976, which produced the first formal **UN Rockefeller Brothers Fund**, compiled and edited by William K. Reilly," including **The Use of Land: A Citizen's Policy Guide to Urban Growth** (1972), **The Unfinished Agenda** (1977), and **Blueprint for the Environment** (1988). (Reilly left his job as head of the **World Wildlife Fund** to become Administrator of the **Environmental Protection Agency** under George H.W. Bush.

Lamb notes that Al Gore's **National Performance Review** resulted in the overhauling of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture to implement the "**Ecosystem Management Policy**," which itself included many recommendations of Agenda 21 regarding management of land and resources. This **Ecosystem Management Policy**, coordinated with existing legislation such as the **Endangered Species Act** and the **Clean Water Act**, gave the federal government more power to regulate land use in rural America. Meanwhile, the **American Planning Association**, in a grant funded by the federal government, published the **Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook: Model Statutes for Planning and the Management of Change**, which provided model legislation by which state legislatures could write and implement Agenda 21 recommendations. The federal government then encouraged states to adopt this legislation by offering incentive grants to states and local governments. In this manner, Agenda 21 recommendations are systematically being implemented across America and the United States is being transformed into the kind of managed society envisioned in the 1976 **UN Habitat I** document.

In his introduction to **The Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide**, Maurice Strong calls local leaders around the world to

“undertake a consultative process with their populations and achieve a consensus on 'Local Agenda 21' for their communities.” In practice, achieving this consensus, generally means painting very scary scenarios of a dying planet in order to frighten children, anger youth and persuade adults to submit to unthinkable regulations. It means blaming climate change on human activities while ignoring the importance of natural climate cycles and the pre-eminent role of the fossil fuel and chemical industries. .

In “Local Agenda 21: The U.N. Plan for Your Community,” (http://www.crossroads.to/text/articles/la21_198.html), Berit Kjos, notes that Chapter 28 of Agenda 21 calls for each community to formulate its own “Local Agenda 21.” policy on land use. Again, this document states: “Land....cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals... Public control of land use is therefore indispensable.” Thus the document recommends that: 1) all countries establish a national policy on human settlements which should 2) facilitate population redistribution according to availability of resources. And 3) “governments must maintain full jurisdiction and exercise complete sovereignty over such land with a view to freely planning development of human settlements.” These policy recommendations are “remarkably similar to those advanced in three publications financed by the

This tactic may sound reasonable until you realize that that the dedicated “Stakeholder Group” that organizes and oversees local transformation is not elected by the public. And the people selected to represent the “citizens” in your community will not represent your interests. The chosen “partners,” professional staff, and working groups are implementing a new system of governance without asking your opinion. You may read in your local paper about “visioning” work groups, Total Quality Management, and partnership between churches, welfare and social service agencies, and other community groups. **These are clues that, behind the scenes, the plan is moving forward.**

The goals and strategies are outlined in **Sustainable America**, the report from our **President’s Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD)**. President Clinton’s **PCSD** is merely one of about 150 similar councils established by nations around the world, all following guidelines from the **United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development**. The same steps and strategies are detailed in **Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide: An Introduction to Sustainable Development**. This “planning framework for sustainable development at the local level” was prepared by the **International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI)** in partnership with the **United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP)** and the **International Development Research Centre** in Canada. Remember, **UNEP** also prepared the **GBA (UN Global Biodiversity Assessment)** which supposedly proves the environmental “crisis.” Could there be a conflict of interest here?

V. The Wildlands Project

Sustainable development addresses land use through two action plans, the first of which is the Wildlands Project. The Wildlands Project is the plan to eliminate human presence on over 50% of the American landscape. And to heavily control human activity on most of the rest of American land. Examples of the piece-to- piece implementation of the Wildlands Project include road closings, dam-busting, and water grabbing policies, and the adoption of United Nations Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage Sites. Areas that have become Biosphere Reserves and Heritage sites are systematically being closed even to recreational use. The most significant tools of the Wildlands Project are the rapidly expanding impositions of habitat “protection” provisions in the Endangered Species Act, various “conservation easements,” and direct land acquisitions from battered “willing sellers.”

Transforming America: Sustainable Development www.freedom21santacruz.net/thereport/Transforming_America.pdf

The **United Nation’s** “environmental agenda” was strongly supported by the Clinton administration. The **Ecosystem Management Plan**, promoted by VP Al Gore, calls for 50% of the land of the U.S. to be returned to wilderness. Indeed, twenty federal agencies, with the **EPA** as the enforcer, are being used to implement this plan (Karen Lee Bixman, “The Taking of America,” The Investigative Reporter, March, 1996).

These articles offer a good introduction to the Wildlands Project:

- 1) "Technical Review of the Wildlands Project And How It is Affecting the Management of State, Federal, and Private Lands in the United States," by Tom McDonnell
(http://www.citizenreviewonline.org/april_2002/wildlands_project_history.htm)
- 2) "U.N. Plan to Designate "Wilderness" Areas That Will Be Off Limits to Any Human Activity is Going On Right Under Our Noses! Clinton Takes Leadership Role." <http://www.adelphia.net/-diffview/articles/unplan.html>
- 3) "The Wildlands Project Unleashes Its War on Mankind," Dr. Michael Coffman, <http://www.libertymatters.org/ahri-wildlands-rpt.htm>
- 4) "Explanation of the Biodiversity Treaty and the Wildlands Project," Dr. Michael Coffman
http://www.citizenshipreviewonline.org/sept_2003/explanation.htm
- 5) "Wildlands Project: Incredible, Outrageous and a Very Real Danger"
http://www.mtmultipleuse.org/wilderness/wildlands_project.htm

The **Wildlands Project** and the **UN/US Man and the Biosphere Program (MAB)** are supposedly based on the need to protect biological diversity using core wilderness reserves. These core wilderness reserves are to be surrounded by "buffer zones" that variably regulate human activity to protect the attributes of the core reserves. According to the **United Nations' Global Biodiversity Assessment (GBA)**, reserves would include wilderness areas and national parks, whereas inner buffer zones would permit no agriculture, no more than 0.5 miles of road per square mile of land, primitive camping, and only light selection thinning (harvesting) of forests. The June 25th, 1993 issue of *Science*

The **Wildlands Project** is ostensibly based on the very new science of conservation biology and was developed by Dr. Michael Soule, co-founder and first president of the **Society for Conservation Biology**, Dr. Reed Noss, current editor for the **Journal of Conservation Biology**, and David Foreman, co-founder and leader of **Earth First!** According to Dr. Michael Coffman ('Explanation of the Biodiversity Treaty and the **Wildlands Project**'), the science of conservation biology was largely created by the **IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature)**, which is the chief adviser to the **United Nations** on biodiversity issues and again and includes federal agencies (the **EPA, U.S. Forest, Park and Fish and Wildlife Services**) as well as mainstream environmental groups, including the **Sierra Club**, the **Nature Conservancy**, etc. as members. These groups now actively promote the **Wildlands Project** and the **U.N. Convention on Biodiversity**, even though this latter treaty has not been ratified by the U.S. Senate. If fully implemented, the **Convention on Biological Diversity** would require the displacement of millions of people through unacceptable nationalization of private land, regulations, and forced migration. In the process, millions of Americans could lose their jobs. It would also mean huge areas of America would be off-limits to resource extraction and therefore resources would become much more scarce and more costly.

Interestingly, Dr. Coffman, a Ph.D. forester, and many other scientists stress that there is no clear evidence that reserves and corridors actually work or are even needed. For example, B.L. Zimmerman and R.O. Biergaard stated in the **Journal of Biogeography** (1986, 13:133-143):
magazine states that the plan calls for 23.4% of (American) land to be put into wilderness with no human use and 26.2% of land be put into corridors and human buffer zones with very limited human use. This same article describes the project as: "nothing less than the transformation of America to an archipelago of human-inhabited islands surrounded by natural areas."

The theory has not been properly validated and the practical value of biogeographic principles for conservation remain unknown.... The theory provides no special insights relevant to conservation. Indeed, the theory behind the need for reserves and corridors is being "increasingly heavily criticized... as inapplicable to most of nature, largely because local population extinction was not demonstrated.

Thus, the "science" behind the **U.N. Convention on Biological Diversity** is unverified, and as such, appears to be ideologically- and policy-driven rather than driven by scientific evidence. This kind of misuse of science was common in the old Soviet Union, where facts were commonly suppressed and subordinated to the interests of the state. This kind of manipulation of scientific data is also rampant in the Bush II administration, as described in Robert F. Kenney Jr.'s

Crimes Against Nature: How George W. Bush and His Corporate Pals are Plundering the Country and Hijacking Our Democracy.

Nonetheless, Dr. Reed Noss boldly proclaims (1992):

At least half of the land area of the 48 coterminous states should be encompassed in core (wilderness) reserves and inner corridor zones (essentially extensions of core reserves) within the next few decades.... Half of a region in wilderness is a reasonable guess of what it will take to restore viable populations of large carnivores and natural disturbance regimes, assuming that most of the other 50 percent is managed intelligently as buffer zones. Eventually, a wilderness network would dominate a region.... With human habitation being the islands. The native ecosystem and the collective needs of non-human species must take precedence over the needs and desires of humans.

Noss adds: "I would offer a more ambitious long-term goal, pending human population reduction, that at least 95% of a region be managed as wilderness and the surrounding multiple-use methods."

In "The Wildlands Project Unleashes its War on Mankind," (<http://www.libertymatters.org/ahri-wildlands-rpt.htm>), Dr. Michael Coffman of *Environmental Perspectives, Inc.*, notes that *The United Nations World Heritage Program*, the *UN Convention of Biodiversity*, the *UN Global Biodiversity Assessment*, the *U.S. Heritage Corridors Program*, and "*The Wildlands Project*" by Reed Noss (from *Wild Earth*, Dec. 1992) indicate that the following strategy may be used to implement reserves and corridors:

- 1) Start with an innocent-sounding program like "World Heritage Areas in Danger." Then, for example, bring all human activity under regulation in a 14 to 18 million acre buffer zone around Yellowstone National Park.
- 2) Then declare all federal land (except Indian reservations) as buffers, along with private land within federal administration boundaries.
- 3) Next, extend the U.S. Heritage corridor buffer zone concept along major river systems. Begin to convert critical federal lands and ecosystems to reserves.
- 4) Finally, convert all U.S. Forest Service, grasslands, and wildlife refuges to reserves. Add missing reserves and corridors so that 50% of landscape is "preserved."

Biodiversity and Wildlands Project - USA




Figure 3. Map of proposed new, federally-controlled land designations based on the Wildlands Project

In the map (Figure 3) above, the red zones represent over 50% of the American landscape designated to be core reserves devoid of human presence. Yellow zones are buffers to the core reserves that would include very limited human use. The black dots are smart growth or human settlement zones subject to increasing controls and limitations on how we humans (the so-called “useless eaters”) are to live and move. The combination of the **Wildlands Project** and Smart Growth is the land use component of the **UN Agenda 21** and Sustainable Development.

VI. World Heritage Sites (Biosphere Reserves) and Natural Heritage Sites

Not one ordinary human being on Earth had any say, whatsoever, about the taking of the world's most pristine and beautiful wilderness areas. To my knowledge, the total, global, confiscated acreage has never been published... Some say the Biosphere lands were taken for their water, timber and mineral value. That makes sense, and also goes along with the herding of populations into “human settlements” as called for by the U.N.'s Agenda 21.

Nancy Levant, “Biosphere Reserves- The Kingpin of Gated Communities”

(<http://www.newswithviews.com/Levant/nancy106.htm>)

According to Wikipedia, **UNESCO** World Heritage sites such as a forest, mountain, lake, desert, monument, building, complex, or city, are maintained by the **World Heritage Programme** administered by the **UNESCO** World Heritage Committee, which is composed of 21 state parties elected by the **UN General Assembly**. Sites are designated under the auspices of the **United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)** program on **Man and the Biosphere (MAB)**. At present, there are 851 sites listed in 141 countries. Of these, 660 are cultural, 166 are natural, and 25 have mixed properties. These sites include the most treasured historical cultural monuments in the world, such as Stonehenge, the Great Pyramids, the Great Wall of China, Machu Pichu, the Statue of Liberty, and the

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls. There are 41 World Heritage sites in Italy alone, including the actual cities of Venice, Assisi, Ferrara, Paladia, and Verona and the Historic Centres of Rome, Florence, Naples, Siena, Pienza, Urbino, not to mention several national parks and the Aeolian Islands.

In the United States, there are over 60 World Heritage Sites/Biosphere Reserves, 30 of which are managed by the U.S. National Park Service. These include, amongst others, Denali, Grand Canyon, Great Smokey Mountain, Glacier, Glacier Bay, Mesa Verde, Olympic, Rocky Mountain, Sequoia and Kings Canyon, Yellowstone, and Yosemite National Parks, i.e., the most spectacular parks in America. Altogether, World Heritage Sites/Biosphere Reserves in the U.S. equal the size of Colorado, the eighth largest state (<http://oteroresidentsforum.blogspot.com/>). In addition to the actual parks, UN jurisdiction now also may include “critical buffer zones” which can extend well beyond park boundaries. In other words, **UNESCO** has claimed jurisdiction over the most priceless and precious historical/cultural areas as well as the most pristine and spectacular natural areas in the world! **Figure 4** shows the distribution of World Heritage Sites around the world.



Figure 4. Map of UNESCO's World Heritage Sites <http://thesalmons.org./lynn/world.heritage.html>

A biosphere reserve is an international conservation designation, given by **UNESCO** under its **Programme on Man and the Biosphere (MAB)**. Proscribed new uses of land are tools for implementing Agenda 21, the **Convention on Biological Diversity**, and other international (UN) agreements. As of May, 2008, the World Network of Biosphere Reserves includes 531 biosphere reserves in 105 countries (**Figures 5, 6, and 7**).




Figure 5. Map showing concentration of biosphere reserves in different regions.



Figure 6. Biosphere reserves in the coterminous United States



Figure 7. Biosphere reserves in Alaska and Hawaii

To fulfill **UNESCO** requirements, each biosphere reserve must include three areas: 1) legally protected core areas, which include “minimally disturbed ecosystems,” 2) buffer zones where non-conservation human activities are prohibited, and 3) transition, or cooperation zones, which may include towns, farms, and other human activities where approved. These are the same land subdivisions recommended in the **Wildlands Project**, Agenda 21, and Sustainable Development Programs. Thus, Tony Barnosky, the moderator for the 1995 international World Heritage hearing stated that eventually, the Yellowstone World Heritage ecosystem would include parts of Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana, an area of between 14 and 18 million acres.” (Yellowstone itself is only about 2.2 million acres.) The extra land would be confiscated from private owners (from “World Heritage ‘Protection:’ **UNESCO**’s War Against National Sovereignty” by Berit Kjos (<http://www.crossroads.to/text/articles/whpwans97.html>)).

UN designation of a World Heritage site and Biosphere Reserve does not mean the United States or other state loses the rights of sovereignty over the affected land. However, Dr. Michael Coffman notes that by agreeing to the international agreements and treaty stipulations of the **World Heritage Treaty** of 1972, the U.S. government must manage these lands in prescribed ways in order to achieve certain international goals and objectives. In other words, we have agreed to limit our right of sovereignty over these lands. Coffman notes that the U.S. Congress never passed any law permitting the U.S. to sign on to the incredible list of provisions and socialistic goals contained in the **UNESCO International Biosphere Program**.

In 1996, Congressman Don Young (R-Alaska) introduced “*The American Land Sovereignty Protection Act*” to help protect private property owners and to require Congressional approval of international land designations in the United States. This bill passed in the House but failed in the Senate, despite these strong words from Young:

More and more of our nation’s land has become subject to international land-use restrictions.... A total of 67 sites in the United States have been designated as UN Biosphere Reserves of World Heritage Sites. These programs are run by UNESCO- an arm of the UN... the Biosphere Reserve program is not even authorized by a single U.S. law or even an international treaty. That is wrong. Executive branch appointees.... should not do things that the law does not authorize.... The power to make all the rules and regulations governing lands belonging to

the United States is vested in the Congress... Yet the international land designations under these programs have been created with virtually no congressional oversight.

In 2007, the Alaska Legislature adopted Joint Resolution No. 21 which opposes the designation of any area in the state as a world heritage site, biosphere reserve, or any other type of international designation without the consent of the Alaska State Legislature and affected local governments. Let's hope other states do likewise soon!

The concept of World Heritage Site/Biosphere Reserve has been extended to include National Heritage Areas. According to Joyce Morrison ("National Heritage Areas- Federally Controlled Land Use" <http://www.newswithviews.com/Morrison/joyce44.htm>, as of August, 2007, there are 37 National Heritage Areas in the United States (**Figure 8**). Many more are being proposed. Because no federal laws authorize their existence, Congress has created NHA's on an ad hoc basis. However, each NHA receives federal funding from and is managed and overseen by the **U.S. National Park Service**.




Figure 8. National Heritage Areas in the United States <http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageareas/VST/INDEX.HTM>

Because designated areas are under the authority of the National Park Service they are managed by an unelected management group. While the Park Service claims they have no powers of eminent domain, they are partners with federal agencies that do have those powers. Morrison notes that property owners have no choice but to be included in a designated NHA. They cannot vote for those serving on the coalition that will develop the management plan. Property owners are not notified if they are living in a heritage area. And once land is designated as a NHA, there are no provisions for property owners living in the area to opt out.

NHA proponents say: "In Heritage Areas, local communities and leaders cooperate on efforts to preserve the resources that are important to them. The partnership approach to heritage development involves collaborative planning around a theme, industry, and/or geographical feature that influenced the region's culture and history."

According to Morrison, the proposed Abraham Lincoln NHA, now working its way through Congress, covers 42 rural counties. Agriculture would be the main designated land use, with over 90% of the land privately owned. She asks: "Why would these farmers and landowners want the National Park Service, Interior Department of 'coalition partners' to take inventory and "preserve" the resources on their property?"

Heads up, neighbors! The Congressional bills listed for 2007 include two new NHA's in Colorado: the Sangre de Cristo National Heritage Area (S.443, H.R. 859) and the South Park NHA (S.444). The Sangre de Cristo NHA includes 3,237 square miles (2.1 million acres) in three counties (Alamosa, Costilla and Conejos Counties). And those of us in the San Luis Valley may be interested to learn about the proposed Northern Rio Grande NHA that appears as #35 in Figure 8 above. This proposed NHA extends from the Colorado/New Mexico border down to Taos and Sante Fe.

VII. Sustainable Communities (i.e., Reservations)

Really what we have afoot here is the construction of a global plantation with the few controlling the world's resources.

Judith Moriarty

It will be the humans in cages with the animals looking in.

"Smart Growth" activist

The **United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP)**, formed in 1972, whose first director was Maurice Strong, has remapped the whole world into "bio-regions." In a 1995 article entitled "The Reorganization of Society" (*Eco-logic Magazine* published by **Environmental Conservation Organization**), **UNEP** presented a five-step action plan to:

- 1) Redraw land maps to differentiate biological characteristics rather than political jurisdiction.
2. Regroup human populations into self-sustaining settlements that minimize impact on biodiversity.
3. Educate humans in the "gaia ethic," which holds that Gaia is the creator of all life and all life is part of the creator (the New World Order Religion).
4. Create a new system of governance based on local decision-making within the framework of international agreements.
5. Reduce the use of natural resources by a) reducing population, b) reducing consumption, and c) shifting to "appropriate" technology.

In "The Wildlands Project Unleashes its War on Mankind" <http://www.libertymatters.org/ahri-wildlands-rpt.htm>, Marilyn Brannan states:

What simpler, more effective method could there be for ultimate, absolute control of human populations than the methods that are being advanced under the banner of "environmental and biodiversity protection?" Read the list above once more. Notice who will be in control. Note that humans will be "regrouped" (relocated) in accordance with a master plan. Human populations must be "self-sustaining," which virtually guarantees a vastly diminished standard of living, especially for western civilizations.

The program underway to undermine the concept of private property rights, especially in the western portion of the U.S., is ample evidence that the socialist planners behind this global agenda are implementing their program now. If unopposed, their efforts will, in time, establish by precedent the authority of prevailing governments to control the whole spectrum of human activity: reproductive rights, property rights, lifestyle, consumption, and even the level of technology permitted. It is a ghastly picture... the primary reason that such dramatic progress toward UNEP objectives has been made in recent years is the fact that very few people have recognized that the common denominator in the whole movement is an arm of the United Nations!

VIII. Smart Growth.

The second action plan (of Sustainable Development) is called Smart Growth. Smart Growth will increasingly herd Americans into regimented and dense urban communities. Smart Growth is Sustainable Development's ultimate solution, as it will create dense human settlements subject to increasing controls on how residents live and increased restriction on mobility. In the words of one smart growth activist: "It will be the humans in cages with the animals looking in."

Transforming America: Sustainable Development

www.freedom21santacruz.net/thereport/Transforming_America.pdf

In "The Smart Growth Fraud", <http://www.newswithviews.com/Coffman/mike.htm>, Dr. Michael Coffman notes that urban planning to implement what Al Gore calls "smart growth" supposedly corrects the problems of urban sprawl with its attendant problems of increased cost and pollution, stress, escalating consumption and loss of farmland. Dr. Coffman, however, suggests that evidence indicates that urban planning often creates the very nightmares it is supposed to eliminate, and in the process, it strips urbanites of one of their most fundamental civil liberties- property rights.

Thus, for average Americans, smart growth has to do with land-use control and loss of property rights. Coffman notes that in their (blind?) obsession to preserve natural habitats, mainstream environmental groups such as the **Sierra Club** (which recall, is a partner with the **IUCN and UN** in promoting the **Wildlands Project**) are relentlessly promoting these values. For example, in June, 2001, the **Sierra Club** defined "efficient urban density" as a city containing 500 housing units per acre. This would mean that up to 500 families would have to live on one acre of land, that is 209 X 209 feet. This would require that the entire acre is covered with a 14-story building with 36 small 1000-square foot units on each floor! This is three times the density of the highest density tracts in Manhattan and twice the density of the most squalid neighborhoods in Bombay, India!

Let's get real. Using 2002 data, the **U.S. Bureau of Census** classifies less than 5% of the U.S. as being developed, with less than 2.5% as urban. Even in the densely populated East, New York and Pennsylvania are only 10% developed and New Jersey, the most densely populated, has 30% of its land developed. These statistics alone suggest that the proposal to make 50% of America off-limits to human use has less to do with land preservation than with elite control of resources.

IX. Toward the Green Global Dictatorship

If I were reincarnated, I would wish to be returned to earth as a killer virus to lower human population levels.

Prince Phillip of Great Britain, leader of World Wildlife Fund

An 'agricultural world' in which most human beings are peasants, should be able to support 5 to 7 billion people.... In contrast, a reasonable estimate for an industrialized world society at the present North American material standard of living would be 1 billion people.

UN Global Biodiversity Assessment

Current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class- involving high meat intake, use of fossil fuels, appliances, home and work-place air-conditioning, and suburban housing- are not sustainable. A shift is necessary which will require a vast strengthening of the multilateral system including the United Nations.....

Maurice Strong, Secretary-General, UN Conference on Environment and Development

Isn't the only hope for the planet that the industrial civilizations collapse? Isn't it our responsibility to bring that about?

Maurice Strong

Over the past century, writers such as Aldous Huxley (*Brave New World*), George Orwell (1984 and *Animal Farm*), and H.G. Wells (*The Open Conspiracy*) have described the kind of totalitarian one-world government long envisioned by the global ruling elite of the *International Criminal Conspiracy*. Basically, their "Plan" calls for depopulation of 2 to 4 billion humans and establishment of a despotic feudal system, with confinement of most of the remaining robot/slaves to isolated "human settlements," as outlined in the **Wildlands Project and Agenda 21 above. The international ruling elite would then control virtually all the earth's wealth and resources. As incremental steps en route toward fulfillment of this utopian nightmare, their Plan calls for the elimination of all nations, private property, and all religions except their New World Order Religion, a hybrid of pantheism and witchcraft.**

Up to now, this Plan has been advanced by many different means, including the ruling elite's behind-the-scenes orchestration of wars, depressions and famines, as well as their relentless consolidation of control of the world's money, media, food, energy, and water resources, etc. In the United States, ***The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)***, a subordinate body to the (British) ***Royal Institute for International Affairs (RIIA)*** and the (international) ***Committee of 300***, has played perhaps the dominant role in secretly executing this plan for a One World Government/New World Order (see Dr. John Coleman's, ***The Conspirators Hierarchy, The Committee of 300***). They have done this by incrementally 1) creating a parallel, "secret" ("shadow") government by wresting control, through infiltration and financial manipulation, of nearly all hierarchical government, business, educational, and professional institutions, and 2) dismantling the U.S. Constitution. Today, it seems that the ***United Nations*** and the United States have been chosen as the two principal governance structures to usher in their global tyranny. Even as the U.S. military systematically pillages the wealth and resources of other nations on behalf of this unholy ***Zionist Anglo-American Empire***, America, Britain, and Israel themselves are also covertly and systematically being destroyed and enfolded into the one-world government under the auspices of the ***United Nations***. Indeed, the UN was created to implement the NWO, with its headquarters in the City of London.

Since the vast majority of us stand to either lose our free will and/or our lives under this new feudal tyranny, "the Plan" has been ushered in slowly and incrementally, through secrecy, stealth, and criminal activities. One of the main strategies used by the ***International Criminal Conspiracy*** includes the use of the Hegelian dialectic, whereby the ruling elite sets up conflicts between a thesis and its antithesis in order to arrive at a pre-determined synthesis, in this case, Global Tyranny (**Figure 9**). This is probably our rulers' primary method of orchestrating wars, domestic discord, etc. (Sutton, 1982). Thus, for example, the Rothschilds and their accomplices created the dialectic between U.S.-style capitalism and Soviet-style communism as a way to justify their synthesis, a 40+ year Cold War, etc.




Figure 9. The Hegelian dialectic (from "Sustainable Trouble: The Attempt to Transform the Vision of America," 2004, Michael Shaw)

<http://www.freedom21santacruz.net/site/article.php?sid=247>

In the realm of domestic policy, Michael Shaw observes (from "Sustainable Trouble" cited above):

The challenge for these evil-doers is to bracket the public "choice" between contrasting alternatives each predicated on legal positivism. Legal positivism is the notion that there is no higher law than the law imposed by centralized human authority. Under a regime of legal positivism the "rights" of man are granted and revoked- like an animal's "rights" would be.... The "thesis" of this artificial dialectic is formed by people and organizations who advocate combining the force of government with the power of business. Under Sustainable Development this end is accomplished through the creation of "public-private partnerships."

However, by definition, "public-private partnerships... combining the force of government with the power of business" amount to fascism. In her article, "US Military Targets Southeast Colorado, Part 3," Deanna Spingola (<http://www.newswithviews.com/Spingola/deanna92.htm>) observes that "In a Public-Private Partnership public assets are surrendered to corporations." Similarly, Italian dictator Benito Mussolini stated: "Fascism should more properly be called "corporatism," since it is the merger of state and corporate power."

Note that in **Figure 10** (below), the "thesis" of public-private partnerships (for example, oil/gas companies in collusion with the federal government) is offset by the "antithesis" of foundations and non-governmental organizations advocating social and environmental justice. The artificially-created conflict between these results in the predetermined "synthesis," tyranny of the OWG/NOW. This preferred outcome (tyranny of global governance) is to be instituted through gradual implementation of Regional Governance, Sustainable Development via Smart Growth, the **Wildlands Project**, Agenda 21, Collectivism, and the **UN Charter**. For this artificial dialectic to work, the ruling elite must control, or mostly control "antithesis institutions" such as **The Nature Conservancy (TNC)**, **Sierra Club**, **Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)**, etc. as well as the "thesis institutions" (government-business monopoly cartels such as **Exxon-Mobile**, **Conoco-Phillips**, etc.). They do. As noted above, many articles and reports suggest that many mainstream

environmental groups, including as the *Sierra Club* and *TNC* are now co-opted and controlled by the very government/industry interests that they historically opposed.




Figure 10. “Thesis” (Public-Private Partnerships) and “Antithesis” (Social and Environmental Justice) lead to predetermined “Synthesis” of Sustainable Development and Government-Controlled Society (from Shaw, 2004)

Another result of this artificial Hegelian dialectic is the replacement of the principle of individual rights as defined by the Declaration of Independence and U.S. Constitution with the principle of “community rights” (collectivism) as defined in the *UN* Declaration of Human Rights (Figure 11, below).

Which Philosophy of Rights?

Nature Source	Individual Rights <i>US Declaration of Independence</i>	Community rights <i>UN Declaration of Human Rights</i>
Purpose of government	Protect the natural or unalienable rights of each individual —"That all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights..."	Control the individual for the greater good of a global community —"Rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations"
In short	You're born with rights, government exists to protect them. You and the product of your labor belong to you.	Government grants, restricts or withdraws your rights according to its needs. You and the product of your labor belong to the community.

Figure 11. The critical difference between U.S. Declaration of Independence and UN Declaration of Human Rights. Are human rights bestowed by God or the state?

As **Hoover Institute** historian, Anthony Sutton, observed in **America's Secret Establishment, An Introduction to the Order of Skull and Bones** (1982), the New World Order would be "a planned order with heavily restricted individual freedom without Constitutional protection, without national boundaries or cultural distinction." Even as our "would-be masters" advance the Hegelian notion that the state is absolute and requires absolute obedience from the individual, they understand perfectly well that the state is a fiction. They own and control the state. So in practice, obedience to "the State" means obedience to our would-be tyrants. In practice, however, their drive toward global governance/tyranny is also accompanied by a host of other factors such as child indoctrination, deceit/corruption, war without declaration, permanent revolution and a police state, as shown in **Figure 12** (below).



Figure 12. Hegelian dialectic from Shaw (2004).

X. Solutions

Clearly, the preservation of the United States of America and our civil liberties, including freedom of speech, assembly, religion, etc. as well as private property rights, requires that we citizens become aware of this ongoing incremental replacement of our republican form of government with a world-wide feudal tyranny under the **United Nations**. In this sense, self-education is the key. To this end, I have built a website: <http://911NewWorldOrderfiles.googlepages.com/home2> in which I review many important books and reference many other essential websites, books, articles, movies, etc. The best first step would be for Americans to turn off their television (an essential propaganda tool for the ruling elite) and use the time they save to educate themselves as to what is really happening in the world. This requires work, sustained effort. It is not for the lazy and complacent. Fortunately, there are many, many others who have already done a tremendous amount of research. And much of this work is available now on the internet. So, collectively, we know a lot. Therefore, step 1 is educate yourself. Rather than just accept my conclusions, it would be better to check things out for yourselves. The **9th Annual Freedom21 National Conference** will be held July 24-26, 2008 in Addison, Texas (<http://www.freedom21.org/conf/2008/24.html>). Certainly, the Freedom 21 is an important mechanism for countering the **UN** globalist agenda (<http://www.stratek.co.za/.%5Carchive%5Cmichaelcoffman.html>). In the short term, preserving the integrity of the United States and the U.S. Constitution are the best solution. In the long term, there will have to be coordination and cooperation with other nations in such a way that national and individual sovereignty's are honored around the entire world.

Second, since the **UN** itself is a tool of the international bankers and their myriad front organizations, including the **Committee of 300**, the **Royal Institute for International Affairs**, etc., these institutions should also be exposed and dismantled, with guilty parties brought to justice. Third, the laws and Executive Orders which have been passed and implemented in defiance of the U.S. Constitution should quickly be annulled-- and Constitutional law must be re-established by Americans with integrity.

The simplest steps toward preserving the U.S. Constitution would be as follows:

1. The United States should withdraw from the **United Nations** immediately and make sure all **UN**-related activities are no longer permitted on U.S. soil. The U.S. government must also repudiate all international agreements that have been made with the **UN**.
2. The U.S. Congress should repeal the **Federal Reserve Act** of 1913. This act, itself the result of a well-documented criminal conspiracy, gave the power to print American money to the European (Jewish) financial banking cartels, headed by the Jewish House of Rothschild in the City of London, England.
3. The U.S. should immediately terminate its "special relationships" with Great Britain and Israel. These two countries now more or less dictate nearly all U.S. foreign and domestic policies- policies also intended to bring about the One-World-Government New World Order.
4. The U.S. government should immediately dismantle the **Central Intelligence Agency** (which was created partly out of ex-Nazi SS forces and which works for the international **Committee of 300** rather than for the American people) as well as place a ban on all secret societies, especially including **Skull and Bones** fraternity and the **Masons**. No doubt there are thousands of others that need to be rooted out of our midst.
5. Anti-conflict of interest laws must be enforced so as to dismantle the "revolving door" between government and industry.

And most important, remember that "we" (regular people) outnumber "them" (our would-be ruling elite) by a factor of about a million to one!

References

Coleman, J., 1997-2006, The Conspirator's Hierarchy: The Committee of 300, 4th edition, Global Review Publications, Inc., Las Vegas, NV, 487 pp.

Corsi, J.R., 2007, The Late Great U.S.A.: The Coming Merger with Mexico and Canada, WND Books, 241 pp.

International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), 1996, The Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide; An Introduction to Sustainable Development Planning, 200 pp.

Kennedy, R.F., Jr., 2004, Crimes Against Nature: How George W. Bush and His Corporate Pals are Plundering the Country and Hijacking Our Democracy, Harper Perennial, New York, 279 pp.

Klein, W., and Meck, S., American Planning Association, 1998, Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook, Model Statutes for Planning and Management of Change.

Reilly, W.K., 1973 The Use of Land: A Citizens Policy Guide to Urban Planning, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., NY.

Sutton, A.C., 1982, America's Secret Establishment: An Introduction to the Order of Skull and Bones, Trine Day, 317 pp.

To return to the home page of this website, go to [WATER WATCH ALLIANCE HOME PAGE](#)